

**AD-A274 343**



2

NUWC-NPT Technical Document 10,505  
16 December 1993

# **Sensitivity of Shallow Water Transmission Loss to Source And Receiver Proximity to a Hard Bottom Under Downward Refracting Conditions**

**Presented at the 124th Meeting of  
The Acoustical Society of America,  
New Orleans, Louisiana, November 1992**

**Peter D. Herstein  
Bernard F. Cole  
David G. Browning  
William G. Kanabis  
Surface Antisubmarine Warfare Directorate**

**DTIC  
ELECTE  
JAN 03 1994  
S A**



**Naval Undersea Warfare Center Detachment  
New London, Connecticut**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

93

10 000

**93-31579**

178

**Best  
Available  
Copy**

## **PREFACE**

This work was accomplished under NUWC Project No. A62200, the Shallow Water Sonar Initiative (SWSI), P. D. Herstein, Principal Investigator. The SWSI was part of the Surface Ship ASW Advanced Development Program (SASWAD), B. Cole, NUWC Program Manager. This work was sponsored by E. Plummer, PEO (USW) ASTO B.

**Reviewed and Approved: 16 December 1993**



**D. W. Counsellor  
Associate Director for  
Surface Antisubmarine Warfare**

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)

2. REPORT DATE

16 December 1993

3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED

Final

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Sensitivity of Shallow Water Transmission Loss to Source and Receiver Proximity to a Hard Bottom Under Downward Refracting Conditions

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

E64600

6. AUTHOR(S)

Peter D. Herstein, Bernard F. Cole, David G. Browning, William G. Kanabis

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Naval Undersea Warfare Center Detachment  
39 Smith Street  
New London, Connecticut 06320

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION  
REPORT NUMBER

TD 10,505

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Program Executive Officer  
Undersea Warfare  
Washington, DC 20350-1000

10. SPONSORING/MONITORING  
AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

A

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

Under downward refracting conditions, raypaths from a shallow source will tend to have grazing angles at a hard bottom that are greater than the critical angle and, therefore, suffer a relatively large loss per bounce. As the source depth increases, lower grazing angles can be obtained. When the grazing angle becomes less than the critical angle, bottom loss per bounce is significantly reduced, allowing a possible reduction in propagation loss. A analysis is made for a North Atlantic shallow water area south of Long Island under summer conditions to determine the sensitivity of transmission loss to changes in source and receiver depth for ranges up to 50 km. The results are compared to the previous results of Cole and Podeszwa [B. F. Cole and E. M. Podeszwa, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 41, 1479-1484 (1967)].

14. SUBJECT TERMS

Shallow Water

Environmental Dependence

Optimum Frequency

Environmental Acoustics

Source-Receiver Placement

15. NUMBER OF PAGES

20

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
OF REPORT

Unclassified

18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
OF THIS PAGE

Unclassified

19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF  
ABSTRACT

Unclassified

20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

SAR

**SENSITIVITY OF SHALLOW WATER TRANSMISSION LOSS  
TO SOURCE AND RECEIVER PROXIMITY TO A HARD BOTTOM  
UNDER DOWNWARD REFRACTING CONDITIONS**

**NUWC Division Newport**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**SENSITIVITY OF SHALLOW WATER  
TRANSMISSION LOSS TO SOURCE AND  
RECEIVER PROXIMITY TO A HARD BOTTOM  
UNDER DOWNWARD REFRACTING CONDITIONS**

**PETER D. HERSTEIN, BERNARD F. COLE,  
DAVID G. BROWNING, WILLIAM G. KANABIS  
NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER, NEW LONDON DETACHMENT  
NEW LONDON, CT 06320**

JMM 10/21/92 VG 1


**UNCLASSIFIED**

**Viewgraph 1**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

One of the present Navy standard shallow water propagation prediction models gives results that are independent of source/receiver depth (Reference 1). We would like to improve on this assumption with the goal of minimizing propagation loss in shallow water by optimum source/receiver placement, especially under strongly downward refracting (summer) conditions. We present in this paper our first results on the sensitivity of source/receiver placement over a hard (Biot type) bottom in shallow water under downward refracting conditions.

## SHALLOW WATER LOCATIONS



SWSI Locations 11/25/91 VQ 1

UNCLASSIFIED

Viewgraph 2. Map

## 2. PREVIOUS RESULTS

This work is a follow-on to two previous studies. The first was a recent general study of year-round sound propagation conditions (500 - 5000 Hz) at 10 locations throughout the world, which we reported at a previous meeting of the Acoustical Society (Reference 2). Of the 10 sites studied, seven were found to have a "hard," or low-loss bottom.

**TARGET DEPTH - DEEP**



**UNCLASSIFIED**


The cumulative percent occurrence for a given two-way transmission loss for 80 different scenarios (10 locations, 4 seasons for each) shows that, for most situations, there is significantly less loss for a "deep" source and receiver configuration. "Deep" is taken generically to mean off the bottom but below the base of the thermocline. This was found to be especially true under strongly downward refracting conditions. This result led us back to the historical studies of Cole and Podeszwa (Reference 3).

DUPLICATE DESTROYED 1

RECEIVED  
JAN 10 1968  
FBI - NEW YORK  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION  
FROM : SAC, NEW YORK (100-100000)  
TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (100-447000)  
SUBJECT: [illegible]  
[illegible]

A-1

**THEORETICAL CURVES  
OF PROPAGATION LOSS  
VS RECEIVER DEPTH  
(SHALLOW SOURCES)**




COLE AND PODESZWA,  
*J. ACOUST. SOC. AM.* **41** (6),  
1479-1484, JUNE 1967

**Viewgraph 4. Propagation Loss from Cole and Podeszwa**

Cole and Podeszwa showed that, for a shallow water region with a "hard" bottom, propagation loss was not independent of source and receiver depth and that, for a shallow source under downward refracting conditions, there would be an optimum receiver depth.



## SHALLOW WATER SOUND SPEED PROFILE (SOUTH OF LONG ISLAND, MAY)




AGU DEC 92 11/25/92 VG 6

### Viewgraph 5. Sound Speed Profile Area Foxtrot

### 3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AT AREA FOXTROT (SUMMER)

We chose to study the sensitivity of transmission loss to source and receiver depth at the same area Foxtrot -- a shallow water region on the New England shelf south of Long Island -- under downward refracting (summer) conditions. The sound speed profile showed a weak shallow surface duct followed by a strong negative gradient. The water depth was approximately 57 meters.

## THE MINIMUM OBTAINABLE BOTTOM GRAZING ANGLE IS A FUNCTION OF SOURCE DEPTH




NR111-GA-83(L)-06047.C2a

2302

**Viewgraph 6. Minimum Obtainable Bottom Grazing Angle**

The minimum grazing angle can be expressed simply as the inverse cosine of  $c(\text{source})/c(\text{boundary})$ . With a downward refracting sound speed profile, generally the shallower the source, the greater the ratio of  $c(\text{source})/c(\text{boundary})$  and, hence, the greater the minimum grazing angle. Typically, for a near surface (10 meters) source/receiver, the minimum grazing angle was 15 degrees; for a source/receiver "deep" (50 meters), it was 5 degrees.

## BIOT THEORY




**Viewgraph 7. Biot Bottom Loss Curve**

Chizhic and Tattersall (Reference 4) have developed bottom loss vs grazing angle curves for various frequencies for area Foxtrot based on Biot theory (assuming medium sand). Their results were in excellent agreement with the experimental measurements of Cole (Reference 3). These results show the strong grazing angle dependence of bottom loss and suggest that, since bottom loss is the dominant factor in low frequency propagation loss under downward refracting conditions, considerable improvement could be obtained if the grazing angle was reduced. This could be done, for example, by shifting a near surface (10 meter depth) source/receiver down to a "deep" depth (for Foxtrot, this would be 50 meters).

## SHALLOW WATER TRANSMISSION LOSS

FREQUENCY 800 Hz

BOTTOM TYPE ZERO LOSS




Viewgraph 8. Shallow Water Transmission Loss: Zero Bottom Loss

### 4. DEPTH DEPENDENCE OF TRANSMISSION LOSS

To verify this assumption of reducing transmission loss by shifting source/receiver depth, propagation loss was computed using the Kanabis normal mode model (References 5, 6) at a frequency of 800 Hz, the sound speed profile shown in figure 4, and a flat bottom depth of 57 meters. We chose to compare a source/receiver depth of 10 meters with a source/receiver depth of 50 meters. Our first result was a "calibration" -- by assuming no bottom loss, we should get the obvious answer that both depth configurations would have the same propagation loss. This is, indeed, the modeling result we got.

## SHALLOW WATER TRANSMISSION LOSS



AGU DEC 82 11/25/82 VG 10


### Viewgraph 9. Shallow Water Transmission Loss: 1.3 dB Loss Per Bounce

We next repeated the computations, assuming a 1.3 dB rather than a 0 dB per bounce loss for all angles. This result would obviously not be sensitive to the grazing angle bottom loss dependency, but it would show if there is a significant grazing angle dependency to the number of bounces in shallow water. This would result in a change in transmission loss due to a change in the total propagation path length. For example, would the steeper grazing angle (approximately 15 degrees) from the 10 meter source/receiver result in a significantly different number of bounces, and hence transmission loss, than the lower angle (approximately 5 degrees) for the 50 meter source/receiver. The results indicate that there is not a significant difference in the number of bounces.

# SHALLOW WATER TRANSMISSION LOSS

FREQUENCY 800 Hz

BOTTOM TYPE BIOT (SAND)




AGU DEC 82 11/25/82 VG 11

## Viewgraph 10. Shallow Water Transmission Loss: Biot Bottom Loss

We now repeat the transmission loss computations with the grazing angle dependent Biot bottom loss. The results show a significant depth dependence. The lower grazing angle associated with the 50 meter source/receiver results in a lower bottom loss and, correspondingly, a lower transmission loss than the 10 meter source /receiver and its 15 degree grazing angle.

## PHENOMENOLOGICAL EXPLANATION OF DEPTH DEPENDENT TRANSMISSION LOSS



$$\text{S/R DEPTH} = \min [\text{SOURCE DEPTH, RECEIVER DEPTH}]$$

N0211-GA-83(L)-05047.C1a

2302

### Viewgraph 11. Phenomenological Explanation of Depth Dependency

#### 5. EXPLANATION OF RESULTS

The source/receiver depth dependency of transmission loss can be phenomenologically explained by these diagrams. For a shallow water, downward refracting (negative gradient), sound speed profile, the grazing angle vs depth dependency is shown by the diagram on the left.

For a bottom with a grazing angle dependent bottom loss, this can be simply translated into a loss vs source/receiver depth diagram, as on the right.

The plots shown are for the specific case of a summer downward refracting profile at site Foxtrot and a Biot bottom loss model assuming sandy sediment.

They show that, for this case, the bottom loss per bounce for a receiver/source at 10 meters depth will be significantly greater than for a source/receiver at a 50 meter depth and, hence, will result in a greater transmission loss.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

1. As Cole and others have previously shown, the exact value of bottom loss, being the dominant loss mechanism, is crucial in determining transmission loss under downward refracting conditions in shallow water.

2. Our example, with a sandy bottom, demonstrates that it is possible to select a source/receiver that will minimize transmission loss even under strongly downward refracting conditions in shallow water.

3. The phenomenological explanation for this result is that, since Biot theory predicts for a sandy sediment, bottom loss will be dependent on the grazing angle, and, under strongly downward refracting conditions in shallow water, the grazing angle at the bottom depends on the source/receiver depth in the water column, it is, therefore, possible to optimally select the source/receiver depth to minimize the propagation loss.



## References

1. H. Wyser Marsh and M. Schulkin, "Shallow Water Transmission," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 34, no. 863, 1962.
2. J. M. Monti, J. H. Sammis, D. G. Browning, P. D. Herstein, "A Study of Low Frequency Sound Propagation in Shallow Water Ducts," NUWC-NL Technical Document 4011, Naval Undersea Warfare Center, New London Detachment, New London, CT, 14 February 1992.
3. B. F. Cole and E. M. Podeszwa, "Shallow Water Propagation Under Downward Refraction Conditions," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1479-1484, 1976.
4. D. Chizhik and J. M. Tattersall, "Application of Biot Theory to the Study of Acoustic Reflection From Sediments," NUWC-NL Technical Report 10,115, Naval Undersea Warfare Center, New London Detachment, New London, CT, 8 September 1992.
5. W. G. Kanabis, "A Shallow Water Acoustic Model for an Ocean Stratified in Range and Depth: Volume 1," NUSC Technical Report 4887-I, Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London, CT, 25 March 1975.
6. W. G. Kanabis, "A Shallow Water Acoustic Model for an Ocean Stratified in Range and Depth: Volume 2," NUSC Technical Report 4887-II, Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London, CT, 30 June 1976.

## INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

Addressee	No. of Copies
MAI/NPT (L. Mellberg, G. Gardner)	2
NAWC (T. Madera, T. Hedinger, R. Bollard, B. Steinberg, Library)	5
PEO USW ASTO (J. Jones, CDR Polcari, W. Chen, H. Reichel)	3
PMO (411 Capt. Niffontoff)	1
NRL (F. Erskine, Library, B. Palmer, R. Gauss)	4
ONR/AEAS, Arlington (Feden, Blumenthal, Estalotte)	3
Dr. Robert Martin	1
ONR (T. Goldsberry, K. Dial, R. Varley)	3
ARL/Penn State (D. McCannon)	1
ARL/JHU (R. Mitnick	1
DTIC	2
SPAWAR PD-80T (C. Andriani)	1
ARL/UT (M. Frazer, G. Beauvis)	2
DASN (M&UW) (M. Kijesky, CAPT Ryan)	2
NCCOSC /NRaD (J. Lockwood, A. D'Amico)	2